1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ORDER Page - 1 5. Due to the violations of due process described in grounds two and four of this petition I have been unjustly confined to solitary confinement with "no contact" with my 3 children, friends or family for one hundred and twelve days (112) to date. This has caused physical, mental, emotional pain, impaired my ability to prepare a defense and to this day has be under severe stress and duress, so much that I am considering a plea of guilty just to get out of solitary confinement and be able to call my children and family.

This habeas petition was filed before petitioner was sentenced on March 16, 2006, following conviction on February 13, 2006 of two counts of Assault in the Third Degree, one count of Assault in the Second Degree-Domestic Violence, one count of Rape in the Third Degree-Domestic Violence, one count of Malicious Mischief in the Second Degree, and one count of Tampering with a Witness-Domestic Violence. Petitioner filed a direct appeal of his conviction; that appeal is pending in the Washington Court of Appeals. While his criminal proceedings were ongoing, petitioner filed two personal restraint petitions with the Washington courts; these petitions were denied.

Respondent contends that this court should dismiss this habeas corpus petition because (1) the habeas claims assert violation of rights which allegedly occurred prior to petitioner's conviction; (2) the claims are unexhausted and would be procedurally barred; and (3) the claims could be pursued in petitioner's pending direct appeal.

The court concurs that the claims petitioner raises relate to alleged violations of his constitutional rights that occurred before his judgment and sentence was entered. Accordingly, this court can grant no effective relief on those claims. The claims should be dismissed as moot.

Alternatively, petitioner failed to exhaust these claims in state court by presenting them properly in state court proceedings as violation of his constitutional rights. Before claims may be raised in a federal habeas corpus petition, state remedies must be exhausted; or an applicant must show there is either an absence of available state corrective process or that circumstances exist that render such process ineffective to protect the rights of the applicant. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1). Petitioner's direct appeal is pending, and as respondent notes, he may be able to pursue the claims in conjunction with that appeal. This habeas petition should be dismissed on the basis that the claims are moot, and in the alternative, on the basis that the claims are unexhausted.

Therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED that the petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED**.

The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to all counsel of record and to any party appearing *pro se* at said party's last known address.

DATED this 15th day of December, 2006.

ROBERT J. BRYAN

United States District Judge

Page - 3